

Remarks


The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the objection to claim 18 set forth in the Quayle action of April 4, 2006. The objection relates to the recitation of a single step method, which, according to the Examiner, is indefinite. The Applicant strenuously disagrees with the objection set forth by the Examiner. Single step method claims are not per se indefinite. The Applicant, however, is desirous of expediting passage of this case to issue, and therefore, reluctantly proposes amending claim 18 to include an additional step to charging the capacitive element. The amendment to claim 18 is intended to reflect suggested amendments proposed by the Examiner in a telephonic interview of May 4, 2006. Notwithstanding the Applicants disagreement with the above-noted objection, the Applicant kindly thanks the Examiner for his assistance in prosecuting this case to issue and for his time and consideration with respect to discussing the above-noted objection.

The Applicants believe the foregoing amendment places the application in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the case to issue and is invited to contact the undersigned if it would further prosecution of this case to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Raj Prakash et al.

By



John R. Buser

Reg. No. 51,517

Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: 5-8-06

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351